

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed April 8, 2004. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Claims 1, 9, and 14 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1, 9, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in the specification. Claims 1, 9, and 14 have been amended to address matters raised by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 9, and 14 are in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin, et al. in view of Blank, et al. Independent Claims 1, 9, and 14 recite ". . . a render job having at least one render frame and an associated profile, the render job being associated with a motion sequence of graphic images . . ." By contrast, neither the Austin, et al. nor Blank, et al. patents have any disclosure with respect to render jobs associated with a motion sequence of graphic images as provided in the claimed invention. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 10, lines 16-19, of Applicant's specification. Moreover, neither the Austin, et al. patent nor the Blank, et al. patent determines whether the render job is to be performed locally or remotely as provided in the claimed invention. Nor do the Austin, et al. and Blank, et al. patents distribute different frames to a plurality of servers for individual processing as required by the claimed invention. Therefore, Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-20 are patentably distinct from the proposed Austin, et al. - Blank, et al. combination.

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin, et al. in view of Blank, et

al. further in view of Fontana. et al. Independent Claims 1 and 9, from which Claims 6 and 12 depend, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the proposed Austin, et al. - Blank, et al. combination. Moreover, the Fontana, et al. patent does not include any additional disclosure combinable with either the Austin, et al. patent or the Blank, et al. patent that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Claims 6 and 12 are patentably distinct from the proposed Austin, et al. - Blank, et al. - Fontana, et al. combination.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not provided any indication that the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statements of July 23, 2003 and January 26, 2004 have been considered during the examination of the Application. Applicant respectfully requests the examiner to provide the appropriate indication that the documents cited therein have been considered.

Attached herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement citing documents for consideration by the Examiner during examination of the Application. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide an indication that the documents cited therein have been considered.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charles S. Fish', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

July 8, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073